



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH AT NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 4370 OF 2024

(M/s Hindustan Motor Corporation, Nagpur, Thr. Its Partners
Umesh S/o Vireshwar Khadilkar & Anr.

Vs.

Vikram Buty (HUF), Thr. Its Karta Shri Vikram Vinayakrao Buty)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearances, Court's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Court's or Judge's orders
--	---------------------------

Mr. Tejas Deshpande, Advocate for the Petitioners.

CORAM: N.R. BORKAR, J.

DATED : 25th JULY, 2024

I have heard the learned Counsel for the
Petitioners.

2. The Respondent herein has filed an application for fixation of standard rent. By the orders impugned in this Petition, the Trial Court has rejected the applications filed by the Petitioners at Exhs. 33 and 38. By application at Exh.33 request was made to the Trial Court to record the evidence of Respondent in question and answer form and by application at Exh.38 request was made to direct the Respondent to produce certain documents.

3. The learned Counsel for the Petitioners, submits that on 24.06.2023 the order was already passed on application at Exh.33, that whenever necessary evidence will be recorded in question and answer form. It is submitted that, thereafter on 06.02.2024 the application at Exh.38 was

moved. It is submitted that, as order on application at Exh.33 was already passed, there was no reason for the Trial Court to pass the order again on the said application on 06.02.2024. It is submitted that, by order dated 06.02.2024, the Trial Court has rejected the application at Exh.33 treating it to be an application for direction to produce the documents by imposing cost of Rs.1,000/-. It is submitted that, on the very same day, the Trial Court has rejected the application at Exh.38 on erroneous ground by imposing the cost of Rs.5,000/-.

4. I have perused the impugned orders. The Trial Court has rejected the application at Exh.38 on the ground that, earlier same request was rejected. Though there appears to be some errors in respect of the order passed on application at Exh.33, however, considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to interfere in the orders impugned.

5. The Petition is therefore **dismissed**. No costs.

6. Pending application/s, if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

(N.R. BORKAR, J.)